RECEIVED

JUL 2 2 2005

Under the P	spenindi Reduction Act	of 1995 an namens are	U on the control of brillians	.S. Patent and 1	Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0851-0031 Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE formation unless it displays a valid OMB control number.	
		Ap	plication Number	10/627,61		
TRANSMITTAL			Filing Date		July 28, 2003	
FORM			st Named Inventor	Metvin C.	Melvin C. MAKI	
			Unit	2636		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			aminer Name	Brent Swa	Brent Swarthout	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 4			omey Docket Numbe	0145P34L	0145P34U\$01	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)						
Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Aftidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts		Petitic Petitic Provis Provis Chang Termi Reque CD. N Remarks The Commissi	***************************************		After Allowance Communication to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Repty Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): Interview Summary	
	nder 37 CFR 1.52 or		DDI ICANT ATT	ODNEY O	D ACENS	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name						
4	Shapiro Cohen					
Signature						
Printed name Dennis S. K. Leung						
Date	July 22, 2005	 •		Reg. No.	47,325	
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facslimite transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on						
Signature Mary Ellen Schellen berg						
Typed or printed name Mary Ellen Schellenberg (571-273-8300) Date July 22, 2005						

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form antifor suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 2 2 2005

File No.: 0145P34US01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.

10/627,615

Confirmation No. 4319

Filed

July 28, 2003

Title

COMPACT SECURITY SENSOR SYSTEM

Applicant

Melvin C. MAKI

Examiner

Brent SWARTHOUT

Group Art Unit

2636

July 22, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window, Mail Stop AF
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, Virginia 22202
U.S.A.

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

A Telephone Examiner Interview was conducted on July 8, 2005 with Examiner Brent Swarthout.

Mr. Dennis Leung and Ms. Natalie Raffoul conducted an Examiner Interview by telephone with Examiner Swarthout to discuss a draft response which was forwarded to him on July 6, 2005, in relation to the Office Action dated May 9, 2005.

Firstly, Mr. Leung addressed the issue of the new matter objection raised in the Office Action. Examiner Swarthout explained that the language in relation to the sensor node having an associated longitudinal access tangential to the deformable cable is objectionable as the word "tangential" does not find support in the original Specification and suggested that the node lay along the surface of the cable. Mr. Leung further suggested claim language, such as "the detection zone being transverse to the

Appl. No. 10/627,615 Summary dated July 22, 2005 Examiner Interview of July 8, 2005

longitudinal direction of the cable at the sensor node" and Examiner Swarthout agreed that this wording was better.

Second, and in relation to the new matter objection, Examiner Swarthout stated that the amendment detailing volumetric detection zones and sensor nodes was objectionable as there was no clear basis in the original Specification for the use of this language. In response, Mr. Leung remarked that in Figure 6 there is clearly shown a detection zone in the shape of a trough which clearly shows a volumetric detection zone. Examiner Swarthout agreed that the detection zone appears to be volumetric, however he could not confirm at that point whether or not he would ultimately accept Figure 6 as a basis for the entry of the term "volumetric" in the Specification and corresponding Claims.

With respect to the patentability objections, Examiner Swarthout indicated that the proposed amended Claims seem to overcome the Hunt and Akers patents, however Frederick remained a consideration with respect to patentability. Examiner Swarthout indicated that he viewed the vibration conduit as providing a deformable cable. In response, Mr. Leung explained that the cable is not deformable because Frederick teaches a relatively rigid conduit because acoustic vibration signals returned would be alternated and possibly lost if the conduit was not rigid. Therefore, Frederick in fact teaches away from a deformable cable as taught and claimed in the present invention. Nevertheless, Examiner Swarthout indicated that the argument with respect to Frederick clearly not teaching a deformable cable was not sufficiently highlighted in the response to overcome the rejection. However, Examiner Swarthout confirmed that the line of argument raised in the Interview may indeed overcome Frederick.

Appl. No. 10/627,615 Summary dated July 22, 2005 Examiner Interview of July 8, 2005

In sum, both parties agreed that if the application was amended to overcome the new matter objections and arguments were presented over the cited prior art references, a further prior art search would likely not be necessitated.

Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit any underpayment or credit any overpayment to the USPTO deposit account no. 16-0600 should any additional fees be necessary.

Respectfully submitted

Dennis S.K. Leung Registration 47,325

SHAPIRO COHEN P.O. Box 3440 Station D Ottawa, Ontario Canada, K1P 6P1

/DSKL/NR/ms